

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 07522 01 OF 02 161857Z  
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00  
INRE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W  
-----115391 161903Z /47  
P 161838Z MAY 78  
FM USMISSION GENEVA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9702

S E C R E T SECTION 01 OF 02 GENEVA 07522

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1  
TAGS: PARM  
SUBJECT: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 215, MAY 16, 1978  
(SALT TWO-1747)

REFS: A. SALT TWO-1742  
B. SALT TWO-1741  
C. SALT TWO-1735

SUMMARY: SIDES TABLED THEIR RESPECTIVE PROPOSALS ON NEW TYPES OF ICBMS (USSR) AND ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF ICBM LAUNCHES (U.S.), AS PRESENTED IN MAY 12 PLENARY. SOVIETS REPEATEDLY QUERIED RATIONALE FOR U.S. SUGGESTION THAT 60 MINUTE INTERVAL BE USED TO DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN SINGLE AND MULTIPLE LAUNCHES. U.S. MAINTAINED THAT THIS WAS REASONABLE FIGURE GIVEN CONCEPT OF ADVANCE NOTIFICATION AS CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURE AND NOTED THAT IT HAS ALREADY TAKEN SOVIET CONCERNS INTO ACCOUNT BY EXEMPTING LARGE PROPORTION OF SOVIET LAUNCHES FROM ADVANCE NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS. U.S. ALSO AMPLIFIED EXPLANATION IT GAVE AT PREVIOUS MEETING FOR INCLUDING POSSIBILITY OF DECREASE IN LAUNCH-WEIGHT OF ICBMS BY MORE THAN 5 PERCENT IN PROPOSED

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 07522 01 OF 02 161857Z

COMMON UNDERSTANDING TO ARTICLE IV.9. END SUMMARY.

1. SMOLIN TABLED SOVIET PROPOSALS ON NEW TYPES OF ICBMS AS PRESENTED DURING MAY 12 PLENARY, I.E., PARAGRAPHS 1 AND 2 OF ARTICLE II OF PROTOCOL, PLUS AGREED STATEMENT AND COMMON UNDERSTANDING TO ARTICLE II.1 (REF A). HE OBSERVED THAT POSITIONS OF THE TWO SIDES ON THIS ISSUE ARE COMING

CLOSER TOGETHER WITH AGREEMENT THAT NEW TYPES COULD BE DISTINGUISHED FROM OLD BY CHANGES IN FOLLOWING FEATURES: NUMBER OF STAGES, LENGTH, LARGEST DIAMETER, LAUNCH-WEIGHT OR THROW-WEIGHT, AND KIND OF PROPULSION OF ANY OF ITS STAGES. IN SOVIET VIEW THIS LIST OF FEATURES COMPLETELY RESOLVES QUESTION AS IT CONTAINS ALL THAT IS NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT FOR OUR PURPOSES. UNNECESSARY "DETAILIZATION" COULD LEAD TO INTERFERENCE IN DESIGNING, WHICH IS NOT ONE OF GOALS OF SALT. THAT COULD LEAD ONLY TO DIFFICULTIES, AMBIGUITIES AND MISUNDERSTANDINGS. SOVIET PROPOSALS ARE GOOD BASIS FOR AGREEMENT. PEREZ INDICATED THAT U.S. WAS STILL STUDYING THOSE PROPOSALS AND WOULD RETURN TO SUBJECT IN NEAR FUTURE.

2. PEREZ TABLED U.S. PROPOSED COMMON UNDERSTANDING TO ART. XVI, DEFINING SINGLE LAUNCH OF ICBM, AS PRESENTED IN MAY 12 PLENARY (REF B). SMOLIN SAID THAT SOVIET SIDE WAS STUDYING AMBASSADOR EARLE'S REMARKS DURING PLENARY BUT ALREADY HAD CERTAIN QUESTIONS TO RAISE. WHAT IS BASIS FOR U.S. SIDE'S CHOICE OF 60 MINUTE INTERVAL? PEREZ REPLIED THAT U.S. BELIEVES THAT THIS INTERVAL WOULD ENSURE THAT NO MORE THAN ONE MISSILE WOULD BE IN FLIGHT AT ONE TIME WITHOUT ADVANCE NOTIFICATION. SMOLIN PRESSED FOR MORE DETAILED EXPLANATION, NOTING THAT HE WAS JUST ASKING QUESTIONS, WHICH DID NOT SIGNIFY AGREEMENT. WHY NOT 20 MINUTES OR SOME OTHER PERIOD? PEREZ NOTED THAT MAXIMUM  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 GENEVA 07522 01 OF 02 161857Z

THEORETICAL FLIGHT TIME OF MISSILE REMAINING WITHIN SOVIET TERRITORY WAS SOMEWHAT LESS THAN ONE HOUR, SO THAT 60 MINUTES SEEMS REASONABLE PERIOD TO DIFFERENTIATE SINGLE FROM MULTIPLE LAUNCH. SMOLIN ASKED WHAT THE MAXIMUM FLIGHT TIME COULD BE, OBSERVING THAT IN HIS VIEW VELOCITY OF MODERN MISSILES WOULD PERMIT THEM TO GO ALMOST AROUND THE WORLD IN 60 MINUTES. PEREZ REJOINED THAT PURPOSE OF ART. XVI IS TO BUILD CONFIDENCE BETWEEN THE SIDES AND THAT AN AMPLE PERIOD OF TIME IS MORE DESIRABLE THAN A MINIMUM ONE. U.S. PROPOSAL IS A ROUND FIGURE, WHICH COULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO BOTH SIDES.

3. SMOLIN REVIEWED SOVIET POSITION RE ADVANCE NOTIFICATION, NOTING THAT THEY HAVE AGREED TO NOTIFY ALL LAUNCHES WHICH GO OUTSIDE OF NATIONAL TERRITORY AS THESE COULD RAISE CONCERN ON OTHER SIDE. ADDITIONALLY, QUESTION OF LAUNCHES WITHIN NATIONAL TERRITORY HAD BEEN RAISED. ALTHOUGH, IN PRINCIPLE, SOVIET SIDE DOES NOT SEE WHY THESE SHOULD RAISE CONCERN, IT HAS INDICATED WILLINGNESS, IN CERTAIN CASES, TO CONSIDER NOTIFYING LAUNCHES WHICH ARE TO REMAIN WITHIN NATIONAL TERRITORY. THEY HAD SUGGESTED 10 MINUTES AS TIME INTERVAL DISTINGUISHING MULTIPLE FROM SIN-

GLE LAUNCHES BECAUSE THIS WOULD ALLOW TIME, INCLUDING AN EXTRA MARGIN OF TIME, TO DETERMINE TRAJECTORY OF MISSILE IN QUESTION, WHICH WOULD SHOW THAT ITS FLIGHT WAS TO REMAIN WITHIN NATIONAL TERRITORY. THEY HAVE LISTENED TO U.S. EXPLANATIONS OF ITS PROPOSAL BUT DO NOT SEE ANY BASIS FOR 60 MINUTE INTERVAL.

4. AFTER PEREZ HAD REITERATED PREVIOUS ARGUMENTS, SMOLIN ASKED WHETHER 60 MINUTE INTERVAL PROPOSED BY U.S. SIDE DID NOT PROVIDE SOME RESERVE TIME ALSO, AS DID SOVIET PROPOSAL.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 07522 02 OF 02 161858Z

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00

INRE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W

-----115425 161907Z /47

P 161838Z MAY 78

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9703

S E C R E T SECTION 02 OF 02 GENEVA 07522

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

PEREZ AGREED THAT 60 MINUTES WOULD PROVIDE EXTRA MARGIN OF TIME BEYOND PERIOD DURING WHICH ICBM COULD THEORETICALLY BE FLYING OVER SOVIET TERRITORY. IN REPLY TO SMOLIN QUESTION, HE ADDED THAT MOST OF 60 MINUTE PERIOD WAS REQUIRED TO COVER ACTUAL MISSILE FLIGHT, NOT PROVIDE RESERVE. SMOLIN ASKED WHY SOVIET TERRITORY HAD BEEN USED AS REFERENCE POINT RATHER THAN U.S. TERRITORY. WAS THIS BECAUSE U.S. DOES NOT CARRY OUT FLIGHTS WITHIN ITS NATIONAL TERRITORY? U.S. REPLIED THAT AT PRESENT NO SUCH FLIGHTS ARE BEING CARRIED OUT. IN THAT CASE, SMOLIN CHARGED, U.S. PROPOSAL PLACES UNILATERAL OBLIGATIONS ON SOVIET UNION. U.S. REFUTED THIS CHARGE, PEREZ NOTING THAT BECAUSE OF GEOGRAPHIC CONSIDERATIONS, U.S. FLIGHT TESTS ITS MISSILES OUTSIDE NATIONAL TERRITORY. BECAUSE OF VAST EXTENT OF ITS NATIONAL TERRITORY, SOVIET UNION IS ABLE TO REMAIN WITHIN IT. U.S. HAS NOW INDICATED WILLINGNESS TO EXEMPT FROM ADVANCE NOTIFICATION MAJOR PART OF SOVIET ICBM TESTS, I.E., FLIGHTS FROM TEST RANGES WHEN THEY REMAIN

WITHIN NATIONAL TERRITORY. RE UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE, U.S. UNDER ITS OWN PROPOSAL WOULD HAVE TO NOTIFY ALL ITS TESTS WHILE SOVIETS WILL NOT HAVE TO NOTIFY MAJOR PORTION OF THEIRS. SMOLIN REFUSED TO ACCEPT U.S. INTERPRETATION,  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 07522 02 OF 02 161858Z

MAINTAINING THAT EVEN WITH EXEMPTION FOR SINGLE LAUNCHES REMAINING WITHIN NATIONAL TERRITORY, U.S. PROPOSAL PUTS ONE-SIDED OBLIGATIONS ON USSR.

5. MCNEILL REPLIED THAT LEGALLY SPEAKING, ART. XVI OBLIGATIONS NOT UNILATERAL AT ALL AS THEY APPLY TO BOTH PARTIES. ALTHOUGH PRESENT TESTING PRACTICES MIGHT CHANGE DURING LIFE OF TREATY, ART. XVI WOULD CONTINUE TO APPLY. PEREZ CONCLUDED THAT DISCUSSION OF UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE NOT VERY FRUITFUL, REVIEWING AGAIN U.S. WILLINGNESS TO TAKE SOVIET CONCERNS INTO ACCOUNT BY EXEMPTING MAJOR PORTION OF ITS LAUNCHES FROM NOTIFICATION. NEVERTHELESS, U.S. REMAINS CONVINCED THAT EACH SINGLE LAUNCH FROM A DEPLOYMENT AREA AND ALL MULTIPLE LAUNCHES SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO REQUIREMENT FOR ADVANCE NOTIFICATION. SMOLIN AGREED THAT FURTHER DISCUSSION OF UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE MIGHT NOT BE USEFUL BUT ADDED THAT IT WAS DIFFICULT FOR SOVIET SIDE NOT TO THINK ABOUT THIS, EVEN IF THEY DO NOT TALK ABOUT IT. HE INDICATED THAT SOVIET SIDE WOULD STUDY RESULTS OF TODAY'S DISCUSSION ALTHOUGH U.S. EXPLANATIONS HAD NEITHER SATISFIED NOR CONVINCED THEM. PEREZ SUGGESTED THAT IN FUTURE DISCUSSIONS OF THIS SUBJECT IT WOULD BE USEFUL IF SOVIETS COULD PRESENT MORE SPECIFIC CRITICISM OF U.S. PROPOSAL IN ORDER TO FOCUS DISCUSSION MORE CONCRETELY.

6. PEREZ THEN TURNED TO QUESTION RAISED BY KOUKLEV DURING LAST DRAFTING GROUP SESSION (REF C), RE U.S. PROPOSED COMMON UNDERSTANDING ON OFF-LOADING RVS AND PENAIDS, ASKING WHETHER THERE WAS POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING LAUNCH-WEIGHT BY MORE THAN 5 PERCENT. PEREZ REITERATED SCHNEITER'S ORIGINAL RESPONSE THAT IT WAS MUCH MORE LIKELY THAT THROW-WEIGHT RATHER THAN LAUNCH-WEIGHT MIGHT BE DECREASED BY MORE THAN 5 PERCENT BECAUSE THROW-WEIGHT  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 GENEVA 07522 02 OF 02 161858Z

IS RELATIVELY SMALL FRACTION OF LAUNCH-WEIGHT. POSSIBILITY IS AT PRESENT TIME MORE THEORETICAL THAN PRACTICAL ONE. HOWEVER, BECAUSE DEFINITION OF NEW TYPES OF ICBMS PERMITS SIGNIFICANT TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS TO OCCUR, U.S. BELIEVES THAT THIS POSSIBILITY SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO

ACCOUNT.

7. NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR FRIDAY, MAY 19, TO CONFIRM  
NEW JDT EDITION AS OF THAT DATE. EARLE

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 01 jan 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** MEETINGS, MEETING REPORTS, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), MISSILES  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 16 may 1978  
**Decaption Date:** 20 Mar 2014  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 20 Mar 2014  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1978GENEVA07522  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** X1  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D780206-1171  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** GENEVA USSALTTWO  
**Handling Restrictions:**  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1978/newtext/t19780555/aaaabuqr.tel  
**Line Count:** 228  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** 1c53c19c-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ACTION SS  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 5  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Reference:** 78 SALT TALKS 1742, 78 SALT TALKS 1741, 78 SALT TALKS 1735  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 01 aug 2005  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 2681484  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 215, MAY 16, 1978 (SALT TWO-1747)  
**TAGS:** PARM, US, UR  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/1c53c19c-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Sheryl P. Walter  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
20 Mar 2014  
**Markings:** Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014